

USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: DATE FILED: 8/1/2023

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X		
1979 FAMILY TRUST LICENSOR, LLC	:	
and ROCKEFELLER & CO. LLC,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	19-CV-4389 (VEC)
	:	
-against-	:	<u>ORDER</u>
	:	
MEHAL J. DARJI aka MEHAL	:	
ROCKEFELLER and ROCKEFELLER	:	
MANAGEMENT CO.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
-----X		

VALERIE CAPRONI, United States District Judge:

WHEREAS on July 28, 2023, the parties appeared for a hearing on Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion for Contempt, Dkt. 57.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, as discussed at the hearing, Defendant must provide Plaintiffs (through counsel Mr. Neil Kelly) a list of any other accounts that were omitted from Plaintiffs' recently-provided list of infringing accounts (*see* Dkt. 93) that utilize, reference, include, or otherwise purport to be associated with the "Rockefeller" mark, by no later than **August 2, 2023**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, to allow sufficient time to obtain Defendant's consent, by no later than **August 18, 2023**, Plaintiffs must file on ECF proposed consent orders that are directed at each of the relevant ISPs to disable the infringing accounts and/or email addresses.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, as set forth in this Court's May 12, 2023 Order (Dkt. 70), Defendant's motion to vacate the Default Judgment (Dkt. 74) is DENIED.


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant's motion for an extension of time to file an appeal of the purported judgment entered on "July 22, 2000" (Dkt. 76) is DENIED.¹

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Contempt at docket entry 57 is DENIED without prejudice in light of the parties' agreement to take the actions described above.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to terminate the open motions at docket entries 57, 74, and 76.

SO ORDERED.

Date: August 1, 2023
New York, NY



VALERIE CAPRONI
United States District Judge

¹ On June 2, 2023, Mr. Darji moved for an extension of time to file an appeal of a judgment entered on "July 22, 2000." *See* Dkt. 76. That motion is denied because there is no judgment entered on July 22, 2000. Even assuming Defendant intended to write July 22, 2020, the only documents filed on that date in this case were in connection with Plaintiffs' motion for sanctions. *See* Dkts. 24–27. In other words, there is no "judgment" entered on July 22, 2020 for Defendant to appeal.